

more effectively than the stem cell research from embryos that some of my colleagues favor. We would think that this would be enough to convince folks where they should be on this important issue.

In case it is not, the fact that living human embryos would be deliberately destroyed in order to obtain their stem cells to me is absolutely appalling. Once we begin justifying the killing of human beings at one stage of development, we invite other troubling applications.

Stem cell research from human embryos establishes a bad precedent and is ethically wrong. Human life is too valuable. Let us condemn the logic of faulty research that extinguishes one life on the pretext of extending others. Instead, we should support the promising research methods that will save lives without ending others.

THE SUGAR PROGRAM

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues defend the sugar subsidy as a no-net-cost program. If that was ever true, it is not true today. The sugar program costs plenty.

It costs tax dollars. Last year the Department of Agriculture spent \$465 million on sugar subsidies.

It costs consumers. The General Accounting Office, a congressional agency, estimates that the people who consume and use sugar, which is all of us, pay an additional \$1.9 billion a year because the Federal sugar subsidy keeps prices higher than they would be in a free market.

And the sugar program costs industry. Companies in my community, in my neighborhood, and other places throughout the country are moving away because the price is too high. That is unfair. It is unfair to consumers, it is unfair to workers, and it is unfair to America.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE IS CRAFTING BALANCED, LONG-TERM ENERGY POLICY

(Mrs. WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House today starts working on a comprehensive energy bill. It is going to be a balanced, long-term approach on energy policy for the Nation.

We have made wonderful strides in the last 20 years in conserving energy in this country. The refrigerator that we can buy today down at our local appliance store is one-third more efficient than it was in 1972.

We also have to increase supplies of energy and reduce our reliance on foreign oil. We have to improve our energy infrastructure, strengthen it, and give ourselves safe pipelines and modern transmission grids and refineries to get the energy where it needs to be.

We have a wonderful opportunity this summer to craft a policy important to the future of this country and to every citizen who pumps gas into their car or pays the family electric bill. We should seize that opportunity.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Although some minutes have passed since the remarks that prompt the Chair to mention it, the Chair must remind all Members that remarks in debate in the House may not include quotations of Senators, except in making legislative history on a pending measure.

FLAG PROTECTION AMENDMENT

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution No. 36, the flag protection constitutional amendment.

The flag stands for all of us in this wonderful country, and the honor we bestow upon it as our symbol is as great as the contributions each of us should hope to make for our Nation.

If the Stars and Stripes could talk, I am sure that they would say, "I am what you make of me. It is up to you to keep me raised high and flying. I am your belief in yourself, your dream of what a people may become. I am all that you hope to be and have the courage to try for."

"I am song and fear, struggle and panic, and ennobling hope. I am the day's work of the weakest man, and the largest dream of the most daring. I am the battle of yesterday and the mistake of tomorrow. I am the clutch of an idea and the reasoned purpose of resolution."

"I am no more than what you believe me to be, and I am all that you believe I can be. I am what you make of me, nothing more."

Mr. Speaker, I consistently vote for this amendment because I believe that all Americans should be allowed to vote on whether to protect our flag.

THE LAW AND ETHICAL STANDARDS DEMAND DISCONTINUATION OF FEDERAL FUNDING OF DESTRUCTIVE HUMAN EMBRYO RESEARCH

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, adult stem cell research is pro-life, but destroying nascent human beings for research is not pro-life.

It is said that facts are stubborn things. Fact No. 1 in this debate, Mr. Speaker, is that Congress outlawed Federal funding of destructive human embryo research in 1996. When the Clinton administration authorized the use of Federal funding for embryo stem cell research, that law became yet another law trampled by the Clinton administration. I pray that President Bush and his administration will not follow suit.

Fact No. 2, Mr. Speaker: As Dr. Weldon said, not one medical treatment has been developed from research done on stem cells from human embryos. Virtually every advancement cited today on this floor was accomplished with adult stem cell research. Researchers describe the usefulness of embryonic stem cells as conjecture.

The Washington Post today alarmingly reports of the creation of human embryos for the express purpose of their destruction. I implore the President to make the morally right decision regarding embryo stem cell research. The ethics and the law demand that we discontinue Federal funding.

The President should do justice, enforce the law, and choose life so that we and our children may live.

□ 1045

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is time to pass meaningful campaign finance reform legislation. Let us take soft money out of politics, let us restore integrity to our political system.

The bipartisan Shays-Meehan Campaign Reform Act has passed in this body twice before. We should finally move to make it law. Shays-Meehan bans soft money for national parties, it reins in campaign advertisements masquerading as issue advocacy, enhances disclosure of political expenditures, and provides the Federal Election Commission with the teeth it needs to enforce the law.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership is determined to drive a stake through the heart of all campaign finance reform. They have introduced a sham alternative that is intended to delay, distract, and to ultimately kill real reform. The bill will not clean up our campaign finance system but rather allow even more money to flow through it.

Their bill would allow a wealthy couple to give \$1.26 million in hard and